

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/769,533	MITSUOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nicholas D. Rosen	3625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Thomas Jones. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 25 October 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Batchelor, Bjorner, Buettgenbach.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Nicholas D. Rosen*  
NICHOLAS D. ROSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Rosen said that he still thought that claim 10 was still obvious in view of Batchelor, and would have to be cancelled. There was then discussion of claims 1-9; Examiner Rosen assured Mr. Jones that he would give due consideration to the arguments presented, especially concerning the combined interaction of the customer, seller, and third party delivery service. If need be, Examiner Rosen would send out a new non-final rejection, but he hoped to be able to either allow claims 1-9 or work out amendments to make them allowable. He would in any case give Mr. Jones a telephone call about the case before issuing the next Office action..